



A comparison of bayesian adaptive randomization and multi-stage designs for multi-arm clinical trials

Citation

Wason, James, and Lorenzo Trippa. 2013. "A comparison of bayesian adaptive randomization and multi-stage designs for multi-arm clinical trials." *Trials* 14 (Suppl 1): P40.
doi:10.1186/1745-6215-14-S1-P40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1745-6215-14-S1-P40>.

Published Version

doi:10.1186/1745-6215-14-S1-P40

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:12152871>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

POSTER PRESENTATION

Open Access

A comparison of bayesian adaptive randomization and multi-stage designs for multi-arm clinical trials

James Wason^{1*}, Lorenzo Trippa²

From 2nd Clinical Trials Methodology Conference: Methodology Matters
Edinburgh, UK. 18-19 November 2013

When several experimental treatments are available for testing, multi-arm trials provide gains in efficiency over separate trials. Including interim analyses allows the investigator to effectively use the data gathered during the trial. Bayesian adaptive randomization (AR) and multi-arm multi-stage (MAMS) designs are two distinct methods that use patient outcomes to improve the efficiency and ethics of the trial. AR allocates a greater proportion of future patients to treatments that have performed well; MAMS designs use pre-specified stopping boundaries to determine whether experimental treatments should be dropped. There is little consensus on which method is more suitable for clinical trials. In this presentation we compare the two designs under several simulation scenarios and in the context of a real multi-arm phase II breast cancer trial. We compare the methods in terms of their efficiency and ethical properties. The practical problem of a delay between recruitment of patients and assessment of their treatment response is also considered. Both methods are more efficient and ethical than a multi-arm trial without interim analyses. Delay between recruitment and response assessment attenuates this efficiency gain. Our comparisons show that AR is more efficient than MAMS designs when there is an effective experimental treatment; while if none of the experimental treatments is effective, then MAMS designs slightly outperform AR.

Authors' details

¹MRC Biostatistics Unit, Cambridge, UK. ²Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, USA.

Published: 29 November 2013

doi:10.1186/1745-6215-14-S1-P40

Cite this article as: Wason and Trippa: A comparison of bayesian adaptive randomization and multi-stage designs for multi-arm clinical trials. *Trials* 2013 **14**(Suppl 1):P40.

Submit your next manuscript to BioMed Central and take full advantage of:

- Convenient online submission
- Thorough peer review
- No space constraints or color figure charges
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Inclusion in PubMed, CAS, Scopus and Google Scholar
- Research which is freely available for redistribution

Submit your manuscript at
www.biomedcentral.com/submit



¹MRC Biostatistics Unit, Cambridge, UK
Full list of author information is available at the end of the article